REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 6 through 20, 22 through 25, 27 through 35, and 37 are pending in this application. Claims 1 through 5 have been cancelled without prejudice by this amendment and will be pursued in a divisional application.

The Office Action has stated that a restriction is required. Applicant respectfully traverses because each of the groups as set forth in the Office Action have the common invention set forth in claims 1, 6, and 32. Notwithstanding the foregoing, to comply fully with the restriction requirement, applicant elects with traverse to prosecute Group II, which includes allowed claims 6 through 20, 22 through 25, 27 through 35, and 37.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 through 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Forsythe in view of Wiesner. This rejection is moot as claims 1 through 5 have been cancelled without prejudice.

The Office Action has allowed claims 6 through 20, 22 through 25, 27 through 35, and 37.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully urge that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that this application be passed to allowance.

Sincerely,

8/12/05
Date

Andrew C. Gust
Reg. No. 47,620
Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero
& Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
telephone (203) 327-4500
fax (203) 327-6401